

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 3, 5-23 are pending in the present application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2 and 4 are canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein, claims 3, 5-9, 11, 14, 15, 20 and 21 are amended. Claims 22 and 23 are added. No new matter has been added.

Support for the amendments to claims 15, 20, 21 and new claim 22 is found throughout the specification, drawing figures, and claims as filed. Claims 5-9, 11 and 14 are amended for correction of informalities. Claim 3 is amended to include the features of claim 4. Claims 5, 6 and 7 are amended to revise their dependency.

For the following reasons, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102

On page 2, item 1 of the Office Action, claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,377,818 to Irube et al. (hereinafter "Irube"). The rejection of canceled claims 1, 2 and 4 is moot. As to claims 3 and 5-21, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that Irube fails to disclose or suggest distinguishing whether the call is the video call or the voice call based on an origination continuation message transmitted after the origination message, and connecting the call between the origination terminal and the destination terminal after the distinguishing operation according to the result of the distinguishing operation, as recited in claim 3. Further, Irube fails to disclose or suggest

distinguishing whether a call is the video call or the voice call based on an origination continuation message transmitted by the originating terminal after the originating message, if the originating message includes the origination continuation message information, and connecting the call between the origination terminal and the destination terminal after the distinguishing operation according to the result of the distinguishing operation, as recited in claim 9, or distinguishing a call from the origination terminal as a video call or a voice call based on the originating message, by a destination terminal, and connecting the destination terminal to the call using a communication medium identified by the originating continuation message after the distinguishing operation, as recited in claim 15, or distinguishing a received call as a video call or a voice call based on the type of a first communication medium generating the call, and connecting the call to the first communication medium identified by the originating message after the distinguishing operation, as recited in claim 20, or a terminal with means for distinguishing and indicating whether a video call or a voice call is received from a wireless communication network, and means for connecting the video call to a video communication medium associated with the terminal, wherein the means for connecting performs the connecting operation after the means for distinguishing and indicating performs the distinguishing and indication operations, as recited in claim 21.

Irube discloses a communication terminal apparatus having a small housing for voice only communication, and a larger housing for both video and voice communications (see, for example, Abstract of Irube). In various embodiments shown in Irube, voice communication

occurs first by using the small housing for the voice communication. Then, after a user confirms that video, data, or multimedia communication is possible, communication is switched over to the video, data, or multimedia mode (see, for example, abstract at line 9; col. 13, lines 25-52; col. 16, line 35 through col. 17, line 10; col. 19, lines 2-43, Fig. 11-17; and claim 1, line 14 of Irube).

In other words, voice communication must precede before agreement between users is reached to switch to video, data or multimedia mode. Therefore, Irube fails to disclose or suggest a distinguishing operation, as variously recited in claims 3, 9, 15, 20, or 21, by a destination terminal, or based on an origination continuation message, or using a sub-address, , or the connecting operation after the distinguishing operation, as recited in claims 1, 3, 9, 15, 20 or 21.

Consequently, independent claims 3, 9, 15, 20 and 21 are patentable over Irube. Claims 4-8, which depend from claim 3, claims 10-14, which depend from claim 9, claims 16-19, which depend from claim 15, are also patentable over the applied reference for at least the reasons discussed above and for the additional features they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. NEW CLAIMS

New claims 22 and 23 are also patentable over the applied reference to Irube for at least their dependence from their respective independent claims, as well as for the additional features

Serial No. 10/024,296
Reply to Office Action of June 22, 2005

Docket No. P-0302

they recite. Therefore, prompt consideration and allowance of new claims 22 and 23 are also respectfully requested.

III. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Seth S. Kim, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Seth S. Kim
Registration No. 54,577

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/SSK:knv

Date: September 19, 2005

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610